R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 563 UD 004 445

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR 1966--ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, TITLE I.

BY- CREW, JOHN L. PYLES, THOMAS W.
MARYLAND STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, BALTIMORE

PUB DATE 15 DEC 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.44 59P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ANNUAL REPORTS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, GUIDELINES, STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, ACHIEVEMENT, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, TEST RESULTS, TABLES (DATA), INNOVATION, MARYLAND

THIS REPORT IS THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF MARYLAND'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROJECTS. THE REPORT CONTAINS THREE PARTS--AN OVERALL REVIEW OF THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE PROJECTS, A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS, AND A SECTION OF TABULAR DATA. INCLUDED ARE THE GUIDELINES AND POLICIES PREPARED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR USE BY LOCAL AGENCIES DEVELOPING ACCEPTABLE PROJECTS. THE OVERVIEW PRESENTS MATERIAL ON (1) THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION TO LOCAL AGENCIES, (2) THE DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION METHODS, (3) MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS, (4) THE COORDINATION OF TITLE I WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS, (5) INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE TITLES OF THE ACT, (6) INTERDISTRICT COOPERATION, AND (7) NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION. THE COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS SECTION CONSISTS FOR THE MOST PART OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION, AND THE TABLES IN THE LAST SECTION SUMMARIZE ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS. (NH)

ED017563

State of Maryland
Title I Evaluation Report
Parts I, II, and III

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
301 WEST PRESTON STREET, BALTIMORE 21201

December 15, 1966

Dr. Martin W. Spickler, Senior Program Specialist
Division of Program Operation, Programs Branch
United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20202

Dear Dr. Spickler:

This letter transmits five copies of State Department of Education's Annual Evaluation Report for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I.

At the end of the main body of this report, you will find special notes related to projects for handicapped pupils in this state.

Sincerely yours,

John L. Crew

John L. Crew,
Supervisor of Research (Evaluation)

JLC/b
Encl.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
301 WEST PRESTON STREET, BALTIMORE 21201

UD 004 445

State Annual Report for previous Fiscal Year 1966: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965---Title I

Submitted to: Division of Program Operations,
United States Office of Education

Prepared by: John L. Crew, Supervisor
of Research (Evaluation),
Division of Research and Development

Thomas W. Pyles, Director,
Division of Federal-State Programs

STATE OF MARYLAND

TITLE I EVALUATION REPORT

PART I:

1 - OPERATION AND SERVICES:

Stimulated to a large measure by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Maryland State Department of Education established a new division of the Department entitled the Division of Federal-State Programs. Included in this Division are personnel with assignments specifically related to Title I. In addition to a State Title I Coordinator who devotes a major share of his time to this responsibility, there are now three professionally qualified instructional supervisors who provide consultative services to the twenty-four local educational agencies in the State. They spend a great portion of their time in the field visiting with and counseling local personnel regarding Title I projects contemplated, in operation, or in retrospect. In addition, a Title I staff specialist is employed in the Division of Research and Development of the Department. This person, who is qualified in the field of research and evaluation, is devoting his time to counseling with LEA's regarding their evaluation plans for projects. He also assumes responsibility for the overall evaluation of the program for the State. The State Title I personnel call constantly upon specialized staff members of the divisions of the Department, particularly the Division of Instruction. These persons are utilized in assisting local school systems with their Title I projects. This kind of cooperative approach is deemed essential in the Maryland organization since there has been an adoption of the policy that Title I projects constitute an integral part of the total instructional program.

Last spring, when it became evident that the new Federal programs were imposing an extremely heavy demand upon the financial accounting resources of many LEA's in the State, the Department arranged for a contract with a qualified accounting agency to work for an extended period with such LEA's toward the establishment of uniform and practical accounting procedures in the local systems geared especially to the operation of Federal programs of educational assistance.

The State Department staff has planned and conducted a number of State conferences for local personnel involved in Title I programs. Since Maryland is a relatively small State with only twenty-four local school systems, regional conferences are not considered as necessary as might be the case in larger States. Thus, State-wide conferences tend to be the rule. The most recent and a conference of major importance is to be held in the month of December, 1966. This is a conference patterned after the National Conference on the Education of Disadvantaged Children and will involve a cross section of persons professional and lay who have some interest in this particular subject.

2 - DISSEMINATION:

(a) Local educational agencies utilize no formal means of disseminating data to the State agency although contact is maintained.

In general, however, dissemination techniques used for the local projects are reported in the following order of percentage-frequencies.

Presentations to local instructional groups	96.4%
Locally prepared reports for entire staff	80.4%
Presentations to community groups	7.1%
Radio presentations	35.7%
Other methods then those provided in the report instrument	92.9%
Television presentations	7.1%
Publications for professional journals	30.4%

(b) Promising practices observed by Supervisors are informally disseminated to other LEA's as they perform site visits. The Division of Federal State Relations also publishes periodically and circulates a newsletter which contains information relative to Title I and other aspects of the federal programs.

3 - EVALUATION:

(a) Because of the lack of staff no formal evaluation guidelines were prepared. Evaluation assistance was attempted by the Supervisors of Instruction as a regular part of their consulting function for Title I projects. These supervisors emphasized the imperative needs to collect baseline data, to restate objectives of the projects so that they could be operationally observed as the project progressed, and to collect data or evidence which would indicate project outcomes. One session of a State-wide Title I Conference held in June 1966 was devoted to evaluation. A second Conference held in October 1966 was devoted exclusively to the evaluation of Title I projects. A uniform set of evaluation report forms was developed by the State and sent to each LEA in early September 1966.

(b) Mr. Thomas W. Pyles, Director of Federal-State Relations, Dr. Percy Williams, Supervisor of Instruction, Mr. Charles O. Burns, Jr., Supervisor of Instruction and Mr. Raymond I. Muller, Supervisor of Instruction, provided the evaluative assistance referenced in (a) above prior to July, 1966. Beginning July 1, 1966 Mr. John L. Crew, Supervisor of Research (Evaluation) joined to staff and cooperatively assumes the major function of providing evaluation assistance.

(c) The U. S. Office of Education provided invaluable assistance in disseminating evaluation forms prepared by other states to us. Also, personnel from the Division of Program Operations, Programs Branch held various conferences from which the state was able to obtain some general assistance in planning for evaluation.

(d) Projects employing the following evaluation designs:

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
4	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
21	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
5	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State, or national groups.
11	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
10	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
19	Other (specify) Observations; teachers, parents and consultants. Teacher made tests. Anecdotal records. Informal ratings.

4 - MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS:

(a) Major problems encountered by the State of Maryland in administering the Title I program are listed under subheadings as follows:

(1) Reviewing proposals - We have no problems here that could properly be labeled "major."

(2) Operational service - There are two major problems in this area. First, we are working very hard to establish procedures whereby qualified professional personnel in the State Department's Divisions of Federal-State Programs and Instruction can work together with local unit supervisory personnel in the operation and service of Title I projects. This is mainly a matter of communication, of understanding, and of finding adequate time. The second problem area here has to do with the accounting procedures involved in this program. Local school systems are nearly overwhelmed by the demands of this and other programs. They are not sufficiently staffed with qualified persons to take on these additional programs and to meet deadlines for reports, etc. Our action has been taken as indicated above but this is not deemed altogether sufficient.

(3) Evaluation - Major problems here were prevalent during the first year of the Title I operation as they were most everywhere. There was simply not enough time or understanding or qualified

personnel to conduct a truly acceptable evaluation arrangement. The problem has lessened in the second year and hopefully will continue to lessen as these difficulties are alleviated.

(4) Other - Other major problems here concern finding ways to coordinate Federal programs.

(b) Recommendations for revising legislation in order to alleviate problems above:

--Provision of greater assistance to federal agencies, particularly the U.S. Office of Education, to enable such agencies to achieve greater coordination and mutual understanding of federal assistance programs at the federal level.

--Enable federal agencies and particularly the U.S. Office of Education to develop streamlined and more uniform procedures for the administration of federal programs; such uniformity and simplification is especially needed in the area of financial accounting. LEA's, even fairly sizable ones, are being overwhelmed by the variety of accounting that is necessary if they are to implement federal programs on a large scale.

--The formulation of reporting demands which are more realistic with regard to effective evaluation techniques.

5 - <u>IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205 (a) (1):</u>

(a) It should be noted at the outset that largely because of advance counselling with LEA's the great majority of project applications were essentially approvable upon submission. In those instances where revision and resubmission was requested, the reasons were sometimes related to the proper identification of areas to be served, the failure to include adequate provision for supporting services, a seemingly excessive proportion of project expenditure to be devoted to equipment, and construction plans deemed too grandiose.

(b) Probably the most common misconception of LEA's concerning the purposes of Title I had to do with the requirement that the aid must be focused upon specific areas of eligibility and could not be regarded as general aid. The other common misconceptions are listed in order of prevalence as follows:

(1) LEA's tended to be restricted to traditional approaches in attempting to satisfy needs and provide services. Some did not fully recognize that Title I is designed to embrace a wide variety of approaches and services for the disadvantaged children.

(2) That Title I programs were for economically deprived children only. (5 LEA's)

(3) That Title I was to include all children in a Project school. (2 LEA's)

(4) That there was an abundance of funds available and local educational agencies were just to ask for it. (2 LEA's)

(5) That Title I projects are basically designed to help children of specific ethnic groups. (2 LEA's)

(6) That programs can be easily achieved as proclaimed by Federal Government Representatives and that little advance planning is necessary. (1 LEA)

(7) That Title I was to include all areas of the curriculum in Project schools. (1 LEA)

(8) That Title I funds were "to take the place of" funds provided by the county to operate the schools. (1 LEA)

(9) That Title I was part of O. E. O. (1 LEA)

6 - COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS:

(a) Of the 56 projects which were submitted in time for this annual report we find that 32 or 57% of them serve an area where there is an approved Community Action Program.

(b) The total amount of Title I money approved for Local Educational Agencies where there is an approved Community Action Program was $5,418,339.

(c) In Maryland, the relationship between the State Department of Education and the State Technical Assistance Agency is one we believe to be a rather fortunate one. The offices of the two agencies are in the same building, and the personnel responsible in each case are able to relate well to one another. As a result, contacts have been made both formally and informally during the course of the past year. Representatives of each agency have participated in programs conducted by the other agency. The State Educational Agency requires Title I applicants from the LEA's to show evidence of community action involvement at the local level with regard to each project submitted. Where questions arise, the advice of the State Technical Assistance Agency is requested.

(d) Most Local Educational Agencies report an excellent working relationship with Community Action Agencies.

Community Action Agencies have cooperated with Local Educational Agencies in:

(1) keeping them informed of reactions to the Title I programs.

(2) suggesting areas in the county which require greater assistance.

(3) establishing complementary projects thus avoiding duplication of efforts and funds.

(e) There were no difficulties in working with Community Action Agencies. Members of the Community Action Agencies have been most helpful as noted above.

(f) Cooperation between Community Action Agencies and LEA's in planning and implementing Head Start Programs is the prime example of interrelationship in this state.

(g) Where local community action programs have been established in an atmosphere of cooperative effort on the part of LEA's and others in the communities, the coordination has not been overly difficult. Difficulties have arisen on occasion over the facts that administrative and funding arrangements for the community action programs differ in some respects from those for Title I. A further source of difficulty is potentially evident in those instances where a Community Action Agency is established in a community completely independent of the local government of the community; such an arrangement makes cooperation an up hill battle from the beginning.

7 - INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA:

(a) Under the State plan for the operation of Title II in Maryland, emphasis is being given to the establishment of school libraries in schools where non-existed heretofore and to the strengthening of libraries in other schools where such strengthening is needed. The services are made available to both public and non-public schools. Thus, indirectly, schools eligible under Title I are in many cases receiving benefits under Title II; in a few instances, such planning is consciously developed and indicated in the Title I project applications.

(b) At this point, seventeen of Maryland's twenty-four local school systems have some involvement in an approved Title III project. None of these projects involve the direct use of Title I funds; however, many of them deal with such items as curriculum development centers, centers for special treatment of children with unusual needs, and centers for the inservice development of teachers. It might be anticipated that as these Title III projects move more directly into operational phases, a closer working relationship will be developed with Title I projects.

(c) Under Title IV, the involvement of the State of Maryland is just at this writing beginning to be an active one. The Central Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory is, at this point, just in its infancy. It is in the organization stage and has not yet moved to the area of consideration of its operational objectives.

(d) A substantial portion of Title V funds in Maryland were used for recruiting additional, professional staff members in the State Educational Agency, particularly in the areas of the Arts. The services of these and other specialists in the Division of Instruction are being drawn upon steadily for use with Title I projects. Under State policy, however, Title I funds are not used for payment for the services of such personnel.

(e) As indicated in the foregoing, the relationships of Title I with other titles of ESEA have been such that it would not be practical in these circumstances to describe incidents of success as requested in this item.

(f) Looking back again at what has been said under (a) through (d),

the problem areas involved in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other titles of ESEA have been those one might expect to find in the early stages of such a complex involvement as this. These are the necessity on the part of a limited number of people to attend to first things first, i.e., getting the basic programs underway. It might be anticipated that as all these programs become more established and personnel become more knowledgeable about them and more adequate in numbers, ways and means will be discovered and implemented for relating them one to another.

(g) For answer to this item, it is suggested that reference be made to number 4, (a) and (b) above.

8 - COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS:

(a) Maryland has 24 local school systems or LEA's, the smallest of which enrolls approximately 5,000 children. These local school systems have boundaries which coincide with their political sub-division boundaries. Under State school law and more particularly under established policy, each local school system operates with a relatively high degree of automony or under the general leadership and basic standards established by the State Educational Agency. Probably because of these factors, the desirability of establishing cooperative projects does not seem overly important at this point.

(b) Not applicable at this time.

(c) Not applicable at this time.

(d) In spite of the comments above, we note two LEA's have discussed the possibility of cooperatively planning a Title III Center to aid certain types of atypical children. No real progress has been made. In addition, a Curriculum Center is planned under Title III in one LEA. This center, if implemented, will provide for four (4) counties on the Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland.

9 - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:

(a) The involvement of non-public schools in the Title I program has been explained and discussed with LEA administrators since the beginning of the program. A continuing dialogue has occurred in this area which has involved State and local public school personnel together with representatives of non-public schools. The latter are invited to participate in meetings and conferences wherever such participation would be of use to them. In reviewing project applications from the LEA's, the State Educational Agency has pursued the policy of the requiring as a part of the application evidence that the LEA has contacted non-public school officials where such exist in the LEA.

(b) In general, we feel that the development of cooperative public and non-public school projects has been reasonably successful.

(c) Such problems as have arisen have been derived mainly out of matters

of interpretation of the word or intent of the legislation. Generally, resolution of such situations has occurred through dialogue involving public and non-public school representatives. Problems of a lesser nature have sometimes developed relative to the staffing of non-public school operations. Additional examples of other problems are listed as follows:

(1) The distance between schools makes it difficult for children and faculties to participate.

(2) The private schools are often not in the Title I school attendance district, or do not qualify economically.

(3) Differences between public and non-public schools do not readily permit common projects.

(4) Guidelines not specific enough as to how these cooperative projects are to be developed.

(d) In view of the newness of these arrangements, the fact that individual states may or may not have legislation of their own on the subject, and that the states and the Federal government are not operating at the same level with respect to this matter, practical suggestions or recommendations for revision of legislation relative thereto are most difficult to formulate. Hence, none is attempted within the limitations of this report.

(e) Number of projects and non-public school children participating by type of arrangement.

Schedule	On Public School Grounds Only		On Non-Public Schools Grounds Only		On both Public & Non-Public School Grounds		On Other than Public or Non-Public Sch. Grounds	
	Proj	*Children	Proj	*Children	Proj	*Children	Proj	*Children
Regular School Day	4	584	6	1,091	3	569	1	41
Before School Day								
After School	2	67						
Weekend	2	379						
Summer	11	582			1	14		
Reg. Sch. Day & Before School								
Reg. Sch. Day & After School								
Reg. Sch. Day & Weekend								
Reg. Sch. Day & Summer								
Before & After School								
After School & Weekend	1	5						
After Sch., Weekend & Summer								
After School & Summer								
Reg. Sch. Day, Before Sch. and After School								
Reg. Sch. Day, Before Sch. After Sch. Weekend, & Summer								
Other (Specify) summer & weekends	1	16						
TOTAL	21	1,633	6	1,091	4	579	1	41

*This figure is not expected to be an unduplicated count of children.

10 - SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS:

(a) Attached are copies of our original guidelines for LEA's. Also, attached is a complete set of Federal-State Memos, Volumes I and II. These memos furnish continuing information and guidelines to LEA's for implementing Title I.

(b) The State of Maryland has no contract with an outside agency for evaluation. LEA's have also reported no such contract.

(c) Sample compilations of objective measurements (pre and posttest scores) are shown by project category in the following tables as attached or indicated.

PRE-SCHOOL

Table I, (attached)--Metropolitan Readiness Test Form A, 1965

Table II

* PRIMARY MENTAL ABILITIES Test Form 7, 1904--Revised 1963

Grade	Length of Project	Pre-test Date	Posttest Date
K-1	4 months	February 28, 1966	May, 1966

Pretest Raw Score Mean	Posttest Raw Score Mean	Difference Between Means
93.9	98.5	4.6

* No SD available for this sample.

READING PROGRAM-LANGUAGE ARTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS (Forms 1 and 2)

Tables III and IV (attached) pre and post percentiles on Vocabulary and Reading for a sample of third graders.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT

Table V (attached) Iowa Test of Basic Skills Form 1. Samples of descriptive test data for various subtests (grades 4-6) are provided in Table V. No posttest were given, however, some indication of the relative standing of pupils in this project can be seen with comparisons to the Local and National Norms.

(d) Financial accounting will be submitted under procedure separate from this report (we are not clear in this requirement.)

See last page

To Be Revised

A GUIDE FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES
IN
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Title I

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Maryland State Department of Education
Baltimore 21201

November, 1965

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Introduction

These guidelines and policies are designed to familiarize school officials of Maryland with the policies and procedures which will be used in this State as the basis for making recommendations to the United States Commissioner of Education on Title III project applications from Maryland.

General Provisions

Projects submitted by local agencies must give special emphasis to areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families and must be designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in those areas.

Local educational agencies are expected to develop and design effective projects to meet identified needs of educationally deprived children in their areas. A wide range of educational services may be proposed, including health and welfare services which contribute to improved educational performance.

The State Department of Education will approve grants for local projects in accordance with established Federal and State criteria and will grant funds for those projects in an amount not to exceed the maximum amount authorized for each local educational agency.

The U. S. Commissioner of Education will approve State applications to participate in the program, review State administration of local programs for compliance with Federal requirements, and provide administrative and professional services.

A National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, appointed by the President, will review the administration and operation of Title I, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and will make recommendations for the improvement of the provisions of the Title and of its administration and operation. The Council will make its first annual report to the President not later than March 31, 1966. The President will transmit this report to the Congress, with his comments and recommendations.

Project Checkpoints for Local Educational Agencies

1. Has the project been developed on the basis of a careful survey of the area in which low-income families are concentrated?

   a. Have all areas of high concentration been ranked in order of density?

   b. Have the needs of the deprived children in the areas selected been listed in order of the degree of urgency of the need?

c. Can the number of children with each need be supplied?

(Project Area: A school attendance area in which a project is operated. It must have a percentage concentration of children from low-income families that is as high or higher than that for the district as a whole. It must be based on family income data or data indicative of low-income, such as AFDC payments and other welfare data; health statistics, such as infant mortality and deaths from tuberculosis; housing statistics; and data from school surveys which include information on or related to family income. In any case, the local educational agency should show on its application how and on what basis it selected its areas of high concentration.)

2. For purposes of evaluation, has a clear baseline been established in order that evaluative data may be recorded from the very beginning of the program?

3. In the event more than a single project is planned, can the identity and relationship among the several projects be briefly, yet clearly, described in writing?

4. Are the objectives of the project so clear and specific that it will not be difficult to gather evidence to show change?

5. In the selection of a project, has adequate consideration been given to the needs of preschool children and/or out-of-school youth?

6. Have requests for classroom construction been eliminated or reduced to an absolute minimum in project development.

7. Have the special needs of migrant, handicapped, and college-bound deprived children been considered?

8. Does each project have sufficient size, scope, and quality?

(Size: Is the total number of different pupils in all projects commensurate with the number of pupils upon whom the district's allocation is based?
Scope: Is there an adequate variety of coordinated approaches made to helping the educationally deprived children in the district?
Quality: In addition to other criteria, does the local educational agency invest more than one-half of the State average per pupil cost for each participating child in the program?)

9. In terms of the total program of the local educational agency, have sufficient opportunities been provided for the participation of educationally deprived children residing in the district who are enrolled in private schools?

10. Have clear procedures been developed for reporting to the State, at least annually, on a before-the-fact and after-the-fact basis for (1) the educational achievement of children served by the program;

(2) the educational deficiencies of such children; and (3) the educational opportunities available, in the school and otherwise, to alleviate identified educational deficiencies?

11. Is there evidence to show cooperation between the local educational agency and the local Community Action Program (if there is one) which insures that:

    a. Programs are tailored to the interest of each Act?

    b. Programs proposed under one Act are meshed to fit with complementary and reinforcing programs under the other Act?

    c. Comprehensive plans are developed to take advantage of available legislation by working with relevant sister agencies to attack the problem along conceptual lines rather than institutional lines?

        (Cooperation does not permit the commingling of funds but does permit the simultaneous use of funds under each of these Acts to finance identifiable portions of a single project.)

12. Have there been developed adequate procedures and activities for the dissemination of program information which include (but are not limited to) the following:

    a. Inservice education?

    b. Professional libraries or informational systems?

    c. Professional workshops, seminars, etc.?

    d. Gathering useful research and making it available to those to whom it is pertinent?

13. Has the local educational agency established a system of records which will show among other things:

    a. The receipt and disbursement of funds?

    b. The amount of time spent on project activities by each child and by each teacher or other individual employed?

    c. Formal and informal evaluations of individual children?

    d. Evaluations of the project and each of its related activities?

14. Is the local educational agency prepared to complete and file with the State the three forms required (ten copies of each) for local participation in the Title I program:

    a. The Statement of Assurances to the Chief State School Officer (OE 4305-2) required to accompany each project application?

    b. The Basic Data or Part I of the Application Form (OE 4304) required only once at the beginning of each fiscal year?

c. The Projedt Application or Part II of the Application Form (OE 4305) required for each individual project?

State Procedures for Processing Title I Applications

1. Purpose

Projects submitted by local educational agencies under Title I, ESEA, are subject to approval or disapproval by the State educational agency. In Maryland the responsibility for recommending to the State Superintendent of Schools on project applications has been assigned specifically to the Director of the Division of Federal-State Programs. Since these projects are expected to be substantial in size and somewhat complex, it seems very much in order for approval or disapproval to be based upon the most qualified advice available. The Director of the Division of Federal-State Programs will, therefore, arrive at a recommendation based upon the advice of a Committee constituted as indicated below.

2. Personnel

The Title I Advisory Committee will be comprised of the following members of the Staff of the State Department of Education:

Name	Representing
Mrs. Mildred Sowers	Elementary education
Mr. Andrew Mason	Secondary education
Mr. George Klinkhamer	Special education
Mr. Raymond Muller	Research
Miss Annabelle Ferguson	Pupil services
Mr. John Powder	Finance

3. Procedures

It is expected that the members of the Advisory Committee will meet at least once montly with the Director of Federal-State Programs serving as chairman. Additional meetings will be scheduled as necessary.

Copies of project applications under Title I will be supplied to individual members of the Advisory Committee as they are received in the Division of Federal-State Programs. It is anticipated that members of the Committee will review such applications independently prior to meetings of the Committee. In Committee meetings, the two Title I supervisors from the Division of Federal-State Programs will be present to discuss with the Committee any details pertinent to applications received. Further discussion of each project will provide the Director with a consensus concerning the worth of the project which will be employed by him in a determination of a recommendation for approval or disapproval. Local educational agencies will be advised thereafter of the status of their project applications. This status will be assigned to one of three designations.

A. Project approved for funding

B. Project has merit but needs revision

C. Project disapproved (with reasons)

Officially approved projects should bear the signatures of the Assistant State Superintendent in Administration and Finance, the Director of Federal-State Programs, and the State Superintendent of Schools.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL YOUNGSTERS INVOLVED IN THE 1966 PRE-SCHOOL SUMMER PROGRAM ON THE METROPOLITAN READINESS TESTS

Test		Pre-Test Performance	Post-Test Performance	
Test 1 Word Meaning (16)*	Mean	6.0	6.8	
	S.D.	2.0	2.4	
	N	111	156	
Test 2 Listening (16)*	Mean	8.3	9.1	
	S.D.	2.4	2.3	
	N	111	156	
Test 3 Matching (14)*	Mean	4.2	5.1	
	S.D.	1.9	2.5	
	N	110	156	
Test 4 Alphabet (16)*	Mean	4.0	4.1	
	S.D.	2.5	3.2	
	N	110	156	
Test 5 Numbers (26)*	Mean	6.6	7.5	
	S.D.	2.8	3.4	
	N	108	155	
Test 6 Copying (14)*	Mean	2.7	3.5	
	S.D.	2.4	2.8	
	N	108	155	
Test 1-6 Total Test Score (102)*	Mean	31.9	36.2	t-value
	S.D.	8.7	11.4	3.30***
	N	108	155	
	Rating	D-L.N.	D-L.N.	
	%ile Rank	13%ile	17%ile	

Note: D-L.D. Rating - D-Low Normal
* Total Possible Score
** Significant at the .05 level
*** Significant at the .01 level

Table III

SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF A SELECTED GROUP OF THIRD GRADE SLOW LEARNING SUBJECTS ON THE VOCABULARY TEST OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

G.E.S.* Interval	Number of Subjects		Percent		Cumulative Percent	
	Pre	Post				
1.0 - 1.4	13	7	5.6	2.8	5.6	2.8
1.5 - 1.9	26	14	11.1	5.6	16.7	8.4
2.0 - 2.4	33	21	14.1	8.5	30.8	16.9
2.5 - 2.9	77	55	32.9	22.2	63.7	39.1
3.0 - 3.4	52	98	22.2	39.5	85.9	78.6
3.5 - 3.9	21	39	9.0	15.7	94.9	94.3
4.0 - 4.4	7	11	3.0	4.4	97.9	98.7
4.5 - 4.9	4	2	1.7	0.8	99.6	99.5
5.0 - 5.4	1	1	0.4	0.4	100.0	99.9
5.5 - 5.9	0	0	0.0	0.0	100.0	99.9
Total	234	248				

*Grade Equivalent Score

10/66

Table IV

SUMMARY OF THE PERFORMANCE OF A SELECTED GROUP OF THIRD GRADE SLOW LEARNING SUBJECTS ON THE READING TEST OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

G.E.S.* Interval	Number of Subjects		Percent		Cumulative Percent	
	Pre	Post				
1.0 - 1.4	4	3	1.7	1.2	1.7	1.2
1.5 - 1.9	31	15	13.2	6.1	14.9	7.3
2.0 - 2.4	46	40	19.7	16.3	34.6	23.6
2.5 - 2.9	59	47	25.2	19.1	59.8	42.7
3.0 - 3.4	48	83	20.5	33.7	80.3	76.4
3.5 - 3.9	31	30	13.2	12.2	93.5	88.6
4.0 - 4.4	10	21	4.3	8.5	97.8	97.1
4.5 - 4.9	3	5	1.3	2.0	99.1	99.1
5.0 - 5.4	2	1	0.9	0.4	100.0	99.5
5.5 - 5.9	10	1	0.0	0.4	100.0	99.9
Total	234	246				

*Grade Equivalent Score

10/66

Table V

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Reading Comprehension

Form: 1

Grade: 4

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 638

Number Schools: 10

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean:	32.236
Pretest Standard Deviation:	11.698
Pretest Local Median:	29
Quartile Deviation:	12.5

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	159	159	158	159
National	257	150	124	104

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest : Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Arithmetic Problem Solving

Form: 1

Grade: 4

Number Pupils: Maximum number of 638

Number Schools: 10

Date of Pretest April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 13.746

Pretest Standard Deviation: 4.559

Pretest Local Median: 13

Quartile Deviation: 5.5

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	160	159	160	159
National	200	226	112	100

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Arithmetic Concepts

Form: 1

Grade: 4

Number Pupils: Maximum number of 638

Number Schools: 10

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Mean Score: 19.578

Pretest Standard Deviation: 5.759

Pretest Local Median: 19

Quartile Deviation: 6.5

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	160	159	160	159
National	206	161	195	76

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Reading Vocabulary

Form: 1

Grade: 5

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 587

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 21.678

Pretest Standard Deviation: 9.945

Pretest Local Median: 21

Quartile Deviation: 8.5

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	147	147	146	147
National	191	162	107	127

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Reading Comprehension

Form: 1

Grade: 5

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 587

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 36.905

Pretest Standard Deviation: 15.014

Pretest Local Median: 34

Quartile Deviations: 13.0

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	147	147	146	147
National	214	143	116	114

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Arithmetic Concepts

Form: 1

Grade: 5

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 587

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 21.433

Pretest Standard Deviation: 8.942

Pretest Local Median: 21

Quartile Deviation: 7.5

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	146	146	146	146
National	202	131	156	95

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARD MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Arithmetic Problem Solving

Form: 1

Grade: 5

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 587

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 11.840

Pretest Standard Deviation: 5.590

Pretest Local Median: 11

Quartile Deviation: 4.0

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	147	146	147	146
National	231	180	103	68

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Reading Vocabulary

Form: 1

Grade: 6

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 494

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 24.114

Pretest Standard Deviation: 11.0908

Pretest Local Median: 23

Quartile Deviation: 9.0

Number of Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	119	119	119	119
National	152	153	93	78

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Reading Comprehension

Form: 1

Grade: 6

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 494

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

9
Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 36.350

Pretest Standard Deviation: 15.0430

Pretest Median: 36

Quartile Deviation: 12.0

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	120	119	120	119
National	175	113	126	54

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Tests or Subtest: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Arithmetic Concepts

Form: 1

Grade: 6

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 494

Number of Schools: 9

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 22.732

Pretest Standard Deviation: 9.1584

Pretest Local Median: 22

Quartile Deviation: 4.5

Number Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	120	120	119	120
National	157	131	123	68

Table V (Con't)

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES

Name of Test or Subtests: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills - Arithmetic Problem Solving

Form: 1

Grade: 6

Number of Pupils: Maximum number of 494

Number of Schools: 9

Date of Pretest: April 1966

Date of Posttest: Not Given

Pretest Raw Score Mean: 12.080

Pretest Standard Deviation: 6.0765

Pretest Local Median: 11

Quartile Deviation: 4.0

Number of Pupils in Percentile Categories:

	Below 25	Between 26-50	Between 51-75	Between 76-99
Local	124	123	124	123
National	194	139	87	74

STATE OF MARYLAND

TITLE I EVALUATION REPORT

PART II:

COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

Each question in this section is to be answered separately for each of the five Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA'S) listed below. (See instructions on page 15 for detailed definitions and classifications.

*1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	Number of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of Children				Average cost per pupil Col. 3 by Col. 4
			Total Col. 5, 6 & 7	Public	Non Public	Not Enrolled	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	15	2,242,403.47	20,924	17,685	1,828	1,411	$ 107.17
B							
C	1	101,446.09	427	427	0	0	$ 237.58
D	40	4,031,190.35	24,261	22,494	1,034	733	$ 166.16
E							
TOTAL							

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS:

Methods used for establishing project areas in Statistical Areas A,C & D are listed in rank order as follows:

SMSA - A -
- U. S. Census Bureau . . . . . Rank 1
- Aid for Dependent Children. . . . . " 2
- School Survey . . . . . " 3
- Employment Statistics . . . . . " 4
- Free School Lunch . . . . . " 5
- Housing Statistics . . . . . " 6
- Health Statistics . . . . . " 7
- Other . . . . . " 8

SMSA C -
- U. S. Census Bureau . . . . . " 1
- AFDC . . . . . " 2
- School Survey . . . . . " 3
- Free School Lunch . . . . . " 4
- Health Statistics . . . . . " 5

SMSA - A (continued)

Attitude

1 Negative self-image

2 Negative attitude toward school and education

4 Low occupational and educational aspiration level

3 Expectation of school failure

5 Other _____

_____

Handicapped

5 Mentally retarded

3 Hard of hearing

4 Deaf

1 Speech impaired

2 Poor vision

6 Seriously emotionally disturbed

7 Crippled

8 Other _____

SMSA - C

Achievement

2 Poor performance on standardized tests

1 Classroom performance significantly below grade level in reading

3 Achievement significantly below grade level in other skill areas

_____ Other _____

Behavior

_____ High absentee rate

_____ High dropout rate

_____ Disciplinary problems

1 Short attention span

2 Other poor work-study habits

Ability

_____ Poor performance on standardized tests of intellectual ability

_____ Low level in verbal functioning

_____ Low level in nonverbal functioning

_____ Other _____

Related Learning Difficulties

1 Poor health

3 Malnutrition

2 Emotional-social instability

4 Lack of clothing

_____ Other _____

SMSA - C (continued)

Attitude

1 Negative self-image

2 Negative attitude toward school and education

4 Low occupational and educational aspiration level

3 Expectation of school failure

____ Other _____

Handicapped

____ Mentally retarded

____ Hard of hearing

____ Deaf

____ Speech impaired

____ Poor vision

____ Seriously emotionally disturbed

____ Crippled

____ Other _____

SMSA - D

Achievement

2 Poor performance on standardized tests ~~---~~.

1 Classroom performance significantly below grade level in reading

3 Achievement significantly below grade level in other skill areas

4 Other _____

Behavior

2 High absentee rate

4 High dropout rate

3 Disciplinary problems

1 Short attention span

5 Other _____

Ability

3 Poor performance on standardized tests of intellectual ability

1 Low level in verbal functioning

2 Low level in nonverbal functioning

4 Other _____

Related Learning Difficulties

3 Poor health

2 Malnutrition

1 Emotional-social instability

4 Lack of clothing

5 Other _____

SMSA D -	U. S. Census Bureau	Rank 1
	School Survey	" 2
	Aid for Dependent Children	" 3
	Employment Statistics	" 4
	Free School Lunch	" 5
	Health Statistics	" 6
	Housing Statistics	" 7
	Other	" 8

3. NEEDS:

The characteristics or needs of the educationally-deprived pupils which were to be met by Title I projects fall into six general categories. These categories are those of achievement, ability, attitude, behavior, related learning difficulties and handicapped.

Within these categories the characteristics of the educationally-deprived were ranked in the order in which Title I projects were designed to meet them. Thus the ranks of the characteristics are determined for the statistical areas as follows:

SMSA - A

Achievement

3 Poor performance on standardized tests
1 Classroom performance significantly below grade level in reading
2 Achievement significantly below grade level in other skill areas
4 Other _____

Behavior

2 High absentee rate
4 High dropout rate
3 Disciplinary problems
1 Short attention span
5 Other _____

Ability

3 Poor Performance on standardized tests of intellectual ability
1 Low level in verbal functioning
2 Low level in nonverbal functioning
4 Other _____

Related Learning Difficulties

2 Poor health
4 Malnutrition
1 Emotional-social instability
3 Lack of clothing
5 Other _____

SMSA - D (continued)

	Attitude		Handicapped
1	Negative self-image	4	Mentally retarded
2	Negative attitude toward school and education	5	Hard of hearing
4	Low occupational and educational aspiration level	7	Deaf
3	Expectation of school failure	1	Speech impaired
5	Other _____	2	Poor vision
		3	Seriously emotionally disturbed
		6	Crippled
		8	Other _____

---

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEMS:

In the various statistical areas several problems have arisen in the initiation and implementation of Title I projects by the Local Educational Agencies.

For statistical area A the most prevalent problem encountered was that of personnel shortages, which was reported by 93.3% of the projects in statistical area A. The next most prevalent problems were those of the inability to secure equipment, materials and supplies in time for the beginning of the project and the shortage of planning time, each one of which was reported by 80% of the projects.

In the area of personnell shortages, the various types of personnel needed are listed below by category and percent of projects reporting shortages.

Psychologists	50%
Regular classroom teachers	35.7%
Speech Therapists	21.4%
Counselors	21.4%
Consultants	21.4%
Administrators or supervisors	14.3%
Social Workers	14.3%

Other problems arising were:

Shortage of facilities and/or space for carrying out a project	40.0%
Inadequate knowledge of Title I requirements	40.0%
Excessive paper work	26.7%
Shortage of administrative staff to plan and supervise project	20.0%

For statistical area C, which was comprised of one LEA with one project only, the following problems were encountered:

Personnel shortages
1. Administrators or supervisors
2. Special reading teachers

Shortages of planning time

Shortage of administrative staff to plan and supervise project

Equipment, materials, and supplies could not be secured in time

Inadequate knowledge of Title I requirements

Lack of funds for specialized personnel

For statistical area D, the most prevalent problem was that of the inability to obtain equipment, materials, and supplies in time which was reported by 72.5% of projects in statistical area D.

The next two most notable problems were those of personnel shortages with 70.0% of the projects reporting these, and the shortage of planning time with 55% of the projects reporting this.

In the area of personnel shortages the following percentages are given below:

Psychologists	53.6%
Counselors	53.6%
Speech Therapists	46.4%
Social Workers	46.4%
Administrators or supervisors	32.1%
Regular classroom teachers	21.4%
Consultants	17.9%

Other problems arising were:

Excessive paper work	40.0%
Shortage of administrative staff to plan and supervise project	30.0%
Shortage of facilities and/or space for carrying out a project	25.0%

Other problems arising were: (Area D - contd.)

Inadequate knowledge of Title I requirements	22.5%

5. PREVALENT ACTIVITIES:

The most prevalent types of Title I activities for the three Metropolitan Statistical areas are as follows:

SMSA - A -	Improvement of Reading Competency and Language Arts	Rank 1,	or 50%
	Cultural Enrichment Experiences	" 2	" 35%
	Pre-school opportunities	" 3	" 10%
	Prevention of school dropouts	" 4	" 5%
SMSA - C -	Improvement of Reading Competency and Language Arts	" 1	" 100%
SMSA - D -	Cultural Enrichment Experiences	" 1	" 40%
	Improvement of Reading Competency and Language Arts	" 2	" 27%
	Improvement of Articulation Skills	" 4	" 13%
	Pre-school Opportunities	" 3	" 20%

6. INNOVATIVE PROJECT:

There are no concise examples of innovative projects reported in the SMSA's. As noted elsewhere in this report, the activities and approaches for Title I projects were generally traditional. One example of human interest material is attached for each SMSA as follows:

SMSA A - STATE PROJECT #27 - Survey of Pupil Opinion of Reading

We conducted a very informal survey of pupil opinion of the educational development project in our building. Each child was interviewed individually and was encouraged to talk freely. He was given no time limit and the interview was unstructured - beyond one or two questions to initiate discussion. Notes were taken on an individual basis. The following is a summary of pupil opinion - with the inclusion of several more pertinent pupil comments.

It was quite evident that the majority of children enjoyed the reading program and felt they had benefitted from it. Most of them hope to be included in the classes another year. Many felt they had succeeded although several said the program was more difficult than reading in a regular classroom. Only one pupil felt he had not benefitted and would not want to be included again. He, incidentally, is one child we had particularly hoped to help. His classroom teacher feels there has been much change for the better in his self concept

SMSA - A (continued)

although he is no more able to achieve than he was previously.

Pupil comments seem to indicate an increased interest in reading - both at school and at home - and the feeling that they were more able to accomplish reading tasks in other areas of the curriculum. Several indicated the ability to read "harder" books from the library; some were using outside library facilities for the first time. Most children felt they were higher as a member of a group than when they began and several reported higher grades in reading and social studies.

Michael is a fifth grader who knew he was being retained. He feels he will benefit from repeating the grade and does not consider himself a "failure". He says he can "figure words" better now and likes reading more than he did.

Bob is also a fifth grader. He would like to be in the program again. He said, "I"m at the top of my group now. I was always the dumbest before." (He still places lowest in his group - according to tests.)

Calvin enjoys the program and feels he is doing better. "I ain't getting hollered at at home no more neither", he said. Calvin is a sixth grader who has never been able to achieve. He has been retained twice and had an extremely poor opinion of himself. Earlier in the year he was a frequent visitor to the office to complain about his teacher or some "mistreatment". He was sullen and unhappy and often rude. Calvin has not visited the office to complain for several months. He is smiling and pleasant and usually moving purposefully toward a task when I meet him. He is seldom truant of late and almost never involved in class disagreements. He was able to make real progress in the SRA materials and it is evident that the program has enhanced his self concept and improved his attitude toward school.

Lester is a third grader who is under treatment by a psychiatrist. He often refused to do any work at all. He now will almost always attempt an assignment and completes most of them. He, too, feels he is a more able reader. He says he can enjoy social studies now also because he can read the books more easily.

George says he can read more by himself now. He also thinks he understands more of what he reads; "I did the best work in my group", he said. (He probably did accomplish more in individual progress but he is not at the top of the group - as he believes.)

The above are representative of the comments made by pupils. We believe they show some enhancement of self concept, some feeling of increased success and an improvement in attitude toward school and academic pursuits.

SMSA - C - STATE PROJECT #1 - Optional

Relate any human-interest story, critical incident, or case study of a typical participant in this project, which describes the pupil's behavior at the beginning and end of the project.

As we went into Title I in February, I had worked with this child as his first grade teacher. He was interested in manipulating objects, enjoying the work with scissors very much, but took little interest in books or words.

When I became teacher-in-charge of the library this boy was a member of six who came together about once a week to hear me read stories, tell stories, show filmstrips and play records. We also talked about experiences the children might have had that were similar.

A few weeks after this program began, as the children were going outside to play after eating lunch, this little boy came into the library, took off his jacket and threw it across the table and proceeded to the Easy book shelves looking at pictures and trying to read the words. He asked me about the book or commented about a picture. He became so engrossed that I had to remind him that the other children had come in from outside and that he was due in his classroom.

From this time until the close of school in June his speech improved and he began to contribute more intelligently in the discussions, but the most satisfying behavior to me is that merry twinkle in his eye when he meets and greets me in the hall or wherever we meet because it seems to say, "We have experienced books, haven't we?"

SMSA - D - STATE PROJECT #6 - Optional

Relate any human-interest story, critical incident, or case study of a typical participant in this project, which describes the pupil's behavior at the beginning and end of the project.

At the beginning of the school session, Abraham showed no reaction to any activity. Two weeks later, however, we knew he was learning because he made the geometric shapes in a finger painting. Abraham progressed from a completely silent child to a well-adjusted happy participant at the end of the school session.

SMSA - D - STATE PROJECT #6 (continued)

Burton, a highly intelligent child, exhibited unusual sex tendencies and almost demanded constant attention from the teacher. During the course of the program he was able to learn sharing his ideas with others without absorbing all of the teacher's time. He did not exhibit these sex tendencies at the end of the project. The mental hygiene staff felt that he had sexual relations, and we plan to follow his activities throughout the early school years.

Freddie, a most precocious child, was almost unmanageable during the first months. After much help and guidance, he was more receptive to management, but still had a long way to go.

Aides solved many individual problems effectively. They were assigned children exhibiting special adjustment problems. These aides would offer much love and a lot of individual attention. In this way some of these children were able to move into group situations faster and with increased improvement.

Another effective idea which improved school-child-teacher-parent relations was the inclusion of parents on the field trips. Parents were able to see the children in group situations under the instruction of a teacher. This showed parents better methods of handling their children. It also emphasized the benefits derived from experiential field trips.

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS:

The following comments apply for all three SMSA's.

In regard to the methods utilized to develop staff for Title I projects it is apparent that most projects reported that of in-service training.

This in-service training was most frequently provided by local administration. College or university consultants also supplied in-service training, but to a much lesser degree.

Increases in staff for Title I projects appear to be most prevalent in the following categories which are listed by rank order:

Elementary teachers	Rank 1
Secondary teachers	" 2
Teacher Aides	" 3

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS:

For each of the SMSA's the most numerously used instruments on each school level are listed below by order of prevalence.

SMSA - A

(a) Pre-kindergarten/Kindergarten

Anecdotal Records
Teacher Ratings
Observer Reports

(b) Grades 1-3

Teacher Ratings
Achievement Tests, examples of which are:

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Form 1 and 2)

(c) Grades 4-6

Teacher Ratings
Anecdotal Records
Achievement Tests:

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Form 1 and 2)

(d) Grades 7-9

Observer Reports
Achievement Tests:

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Form 1 and 2)

(e) Grades 10-12

Observer Reports
Teacher Ratings

SMSA - C

(a) Pre-kindergarten/Kindergarten:
None

(b) Grades 1-3

Achievement Tests:

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills,
(Form 1)

Metropolitan Tests - Reading,
(Form Primary I)

Inventories

Teacher Ratings

Observer Reports

(c) Grades 4-6

Achievement Tests:

California Achievement Tests,
(Form X)

Inventories

Teacher Ratings

Observer Reports

(d) Grades 7-9

None

(e) Grades 10-12

None

SMSA - D

(a) Pre-kindergarten/Kindergarten

Teacher Ratings

Observer Reports

Anecdotal Records

(b) Grades 1-3

Teacher Ratings

Anecdotal Records

Observer Reports

Achievement Tests:
Stanford Achievement Tests, (Form L)

SMSA - D (continued)

(c) Grades 4-6

Teacher Ratings
Anecdotal Records
Observer Reports
Achievement Tests:
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills,
(Form 1,and 2)

California Achievement Tests,
(Form X,and W)

Stanford Achievement Tests,
(Form L)

(d) Grades 7-9

Teacher Ratings
Anecdotal Records
Observer Reports

Achievement Tests:
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills,
(Form 1, and 2)
Stanford Achievement Tests,
(Form L)

(e) Grades 10-12

Anecdotal Records
Teacher Ratings
Observer Reports
Teacher Made Tests

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS:
(Comments are the same for each SMSA)

(a)

1. Early Years - Two projects dealing with the specific activities of oral communication and self-image appear to have been the most effective. Secondly, early admission projects are deemed to have been effective in reducing learning blocks or promoting positive self-images deemed essential to school achievement.

9. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS: (continued)

2. Middle Years. The activities attempting to produce score increments in reading, and general cultural development are judged as most effective for the pupils in this group. As these activities comprised the majority in Maryland, it is believed the gains or trends started were of special benefit to more pupils in the total population of culturally disadvantaged pupils.

3. Teen Years. The activities dealing with the prevention of dropouts show some gains for this group. These activities can hardly be separated from those of cultural enrichment. Therefore, both activities are considered as the most effective for this category.

(b) The specific strength for each activity listed in (a) above is that the project was implemental with so short a planning time. Facilities were generally not adequate, but the programs were carried on. In some instances where facilities were available, materials and personnel with special qualifications were not. The organization and schedule for the activities were adequate and are therefore, considered strengths.

The major procedural weaknesses are listed as follows:

1. Lack of lead-time or late arrival of materials and equipment.

2. Lack of, and failure to execute evaluation techniques.

3. Lack of specialist for diagnosis and remediation.

4. Inadequate project time to effect reliable behaverial changes.

The strengths and weaknesses of Title I activities were interrelated. They can best be stated as functions of any crash program. For example, test materials ordered for posttesting were delivered after the project's termination. In summary, the mere implementation of activities by the LEA's is deemed as outweighing the weaknesses.

10. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF TITLE I

We believe that, with rare exceptions across the State of Maryland, the Title I program has had a marked impact. Indications are that educational opportunities have indeed been extended significantly through this program and that it has provided experiences which should result in improved levels of achievement and in much improved general attitude toward education. It is too early yet to report in specific terms about such achievement or about such improvement in attitutde. We do know that school people from top administrators down to include teachers and teacher assistants of various types have been not only accepting of the Title I program but through experience thus far, they have expressed enthusiasm for its results almost to a man. We are speaking, of course, primarily of those who have thus far been directly involved; one of the problems which hopefully will soon be resolved is that we do not believe enough people, professional and lay alike, are fully understanding of the intent and opportunity of Title I. We are, of course, working toward the achievement of such understanding. We believe that children are being helped directly and indirectly through supporting services and involvement of parents in the community. We believe that there is a spin-off effect which is beneficial to the total educational program. This is in the form of new ideas and broader opportunities in relation to pre and in-service education, staffing, materials and equipment for instruction, teaching techniques, and the in-school community relations. The main question we receive about Title I is: Can we depend on it to continue and hopefully to expand?

PART III - TABULAR DATA:

TABLE 1 - Numbers of Projects Employing Specified Types of Standardized Tests and Other Measures.

	Projects in: Skill Development Subjects					Projects in: Attitudinal & Behavioral Development				
	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Measures										
1. Standardized Tests & Inventories										
a. Achievement	2	24	20	14	1			2		
b. Intelligence	2	6	6	7	1					
c. Aptitude	1	1	1	1						
d. Interest		4	4	3						
e. Attitude		3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
f. Others (Specify)	Self-Concept Scale					1	1	1	1	1
2. Other Tests										
a. Locally Devised Tests	1	6	5	5		1	1	1	1	
b. Teacher Made Tests		15	15	12	4		3	3	2	
c. Others (Specify)	Reading Readiness 1					Pupil Ratings 1		2	2	2
3. Other Measures										
a. Teacher Ratings	6	25	24	23	6	5	14	13	14	5
b. Anecdotal Records	5	18	14	10	5	6	16	16	12	8
c. Observer Reports	5	16	16	11	4	6	13	13	14	6
d. Others (Specify)										

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR TYPES OF PROJECTS

The number of projects reporting varying degrees of progress in achieving their objectives are listed below by activity category. SEE TABULAR DATA #8 for objectives.

Reading Programs: General

School Level	Primary Objective (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Objective 2 (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Pre-Kind./ Kindergarten	1					
Grades 1-3	8			8	2	
Grades 4-6	6			5	1	
Grades 7-9	5	2	1	4	1	
Grades 10-12	2			3	1	
Totals	22	2	1	20	5	

Cultural Enrichment

School Level	Primary Objective (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Objective 2 (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Pre-Kind./ Kindergarten	1	1		1	2	
Grades 1-3	4	2		4	2	
Grades 4-6	4	1		4	1	
Grades 7-9	2	1		2	1	
Grades 10-12	2			2	1	
Totals	15	5		13	7	

Pre-School

School Level	Primary Objective (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Objective 2 (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Pre-Kind./ Kindergarten	5	2		4	3	
Grades 1-3						
Grades 4-6						
Grades 7-9						
Grades 10-12						
Totals						

Dropouts

School Level	Primary Objective (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Objective 2 (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Pre-Kind./ Kindergarten						
Grades 1-3	2				2	
Grades 4-6		2		2		
Grades 7-9		2			2	
Grades 10-12						
Totals	2	4		2	4	

Articulation Skills

School Level	Primary Objective (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Objective 2 (Specify) Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Pre-Kind./ Kindergarten						
Grades 1-3				1		
Grades 4-6	1			1		
Grades 7-9	1			1		
Grades 10-12						
Totals	2			3		

Maryland: Attendance is not recorded by grade. Figures shown represent attendance summed over grades: 1 through 6; 7 through 9; and 10 through 12.

TABLE NO. 3

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH STATE NORM 1/

NOTE: THE DATA ON THIS SHEET REPRESENTS 15 LEA'S.

	If Possible 1963 - 1964				If Possible 1964 - 1965				1965 - 1966				1966 - 1967			
	Title I Schools		1/		Title I Schools		1/		Title I Schools		1/		Title I Schools		1/	
Grade	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12th Grade	7569.2	8181.1	32698.6	34962.4	7935.4	8178.9	32897.6	36283.6	10872.9	11674.5	37001.6	34813.9				
11th Grade																
10th Grade																
9th Grade	11030.5	12790.6	22694.9	24324.1	12164.0	13126.9	24655.6	25900.3	15393.2	15172.7	28952.4	30540.9				
8th Grade																
7th Grade																
6th Grade	30318.3	32078.3	16371.4	8126.0.9	33394.6	35346.3	7841.6	82447.3	49928.5	53329	85446.6	90225.7				
5th Grade																
4th Grade																
3rd Grade																
2nd Grade																
1st Grade																
Pre-Kind. Kind.																

See Attachment for definitions of "Average Daily Attendance" and "Average Daily Membership"

Purpose
To obtain
% of att ndance.

1/ State Norm can be one of the following: (1) All schools in the State, (2) All non-Title I schools in the State, or (3) A sample of non-Title I schools. Indicate which comparison group you are using.

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED TO STATE NORM 1/

NOTE: THE DATA ON THIS SHEET REPRESENTS 4 LEA'S.

	If Possible 1963 - 1964				If Possible 1964 - 1965				1965 - 1966				1966 - 1967			
	Title I Schools		1/		Title I Schools		1/		Title I Schools		1/		Title I Schools		1/	
Grade	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12th Grade	77968	81891	32387	34329	77359	81544	35122	37108	119120	97507	51654	54339				
11th Grade																
10th Grade																
9th Grade																
8th Grade																
7th Grade																
6th Grade																
5th Grade																
4th Grade																
3rd Grade																
2nd Grade																
1st Grade																

See Attachment for definitions of "Average Daily Attendance" and "Average Daily Membership"

Purpose: To obtain % of attendance.

1/ State Norm can be one of the following: (1) All schools in the State; (2) All non- Title I schools in the State; or (3) A sample of non-Title I schools.

Maryland: LEA's did not supply data to permit completion of this chart.

TABLE 4 WORKSHEET FOR DETERMINING DROPOUT RATE

NAME OF SCHOOL_____ **GRADE**_____

Month	Membership at Beginning of Month	Transfers		Graduates	Deaths	Dropouts	Membership at End of Month
		IN	OUT				
JULY							
AUGUST							
SEPTEMBER							
OCTOBER							
NOVEMBER							
DECEMBER							
JANUARY							
FEBRUARY							
MARCH							
APRIL							
MAY							
JUNE							1/
TOTALS				3/		2/	

CALCULATIONS:

Arithmetic Accountability

End of Year Membership 1/	_____
Number of Dropouts 2/	_____
Number of Graduates 3/	_____
TOTAL	_____

Annual Dropout Rate = Number of Dropouts / Arithmetic Accountability

= _____

TOTAL = _____ %

Narrative Tables

DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

Grade	If Possible 1963-1964		If Possible 1964-1965		If Possible 1965-1966		1966-1967		1967-1968	
	Title I Sch.	Non Title I Sch.	Title I Sch.	Non Title I Sch.	Title I Sch.	Non Title I Sch.	Title I Sch.	Non Title I Sch.	Title I Sch.	Non Title I Sch.
12	33	85	52	101	45	117				
11	75	179	72	173	113	258				
10	87	267	92	236	109	309				
9	122	173	147	259	117	248				
8	71	155	85	138	101	146				
7	65	98	80	84	45	127				
(Lower grade levels, if appropriate)										
No. of Schools	37	66	42	67	48	77				
Total No. of Students	16897	43773	23417	46640	25576	57212				
No. of Dropouts	452	957	528	991	530	1205				

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS
CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM 1/

	If Possible 1963 - 1964		If Possible 1964 - 1965		If Possible 1965 - 1966		1966 - 1967	
	Title I Schools	1/	Title I Schools	1/	Title I Schools	1/	Title I Schools	1/
TOTAL NUMBER OF GRADUATES	5040	6329.6	5641.6	7795.2	5499.0	7610.4		
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	40	46	41	48	39	42		
MEAN SIZE OF GRADUATING CLASS	126.0	137.6	137.6	162.4	141.0	181.2		
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING 0 - 10% CONTINUING GRADS								
11 - 20%			1	1	1			
21 - 30%	3	1	4	2	3	3		
31 - 40%	9	5	7	3	4	2		
41 - 50%	2	5		6	2	4		
51 - 60%		3	1	2		1		
61 - 90%						1		

A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, a Vocational, Commercial, or Technical Institute, or a Nursing School.

1/ State Norm can be one of the following: (1) All schools in the State; (2) All non-Title I schools in the State, or (3) A sample of non-Title I schools. (Indicate which comparison group you are using.)

Maryland: Lack of Raw score data, Means, SD's, and diversity in LEA's testing procedures prohibits the completion of this table.

TABLE 7

Tables for the most widely used tests in skill subjects for Title I beneficiaries for: 1964, 1965, 1966 (If beneficiaries are not possible, use Title I schools.)

(RESULTS FOR MOST WIDELY USED TESTS FOR ARITHMETIC)

TITLE I BENEFICIARIES (OR SCHOOLS)

Grade	Month & Year Tested	Test Name	Form	N Schools	N Students	Raw Score $\bar{X}$	Raw Score S.D.	Number of Students Or Schools 25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile

TABULAR DATA #8

A. The five most commonly funded Title I projects are grouped into five general categories according to primary objectives as follows:

1. To increase Reading Competency and Language Arts
2. To provide Cultural Enrichment Experiences
3. To provide pre-school opportunities
4. To prevent school dropouts
5. To improve Articulation Skills

B. The most common approaches used to reach these objectives are described in the sub-sections below.

1. Reading Competency and Language Arts

a. Twenty-five (25) or 42% of the total projects were in this category.

b. The ranks and percentage-frequencies of the Instructional Areas utilized to implement objectives were:

Reading Instruction	rank 1, or	100%
Cultural Enrichment-General	rank 2, or	95%
Teacher Aides and Subprofessional Help	rank 3, or	88%
English Language Arts	rank 4, or	79%
Physical Education-Recreation	rank 5, or	50%
Reduction of Class Size	rank 6, or	42%

c. The ranks and percentage frequencies of the Service Areas utilized were:

Food-Lunch	rank 1, or	88%
Health-Service	rank 2, or	83%
Transportation-Service	rank 3, or	71%
In-service staff training	rank 3, or	71%
Library Service	rank 4, or	63%
Clothing	rank 4, or	63%
Preservice Staff Training	rank 5, or	46%
School Social Work	rank 6, or	38%
Guidance and Counseling	rank 7, or	33%

2. Cultural Enrichment

a. Twenty (20) projects or 33% of the total projects were in this category.

b. The frequencies or ranks of the Instructional Areas utilized were:

Use of Teacher Aides/Subprofessionals	rank 1, or	100%
English Language Arts	rank 2, or	88%
Reading Instruction	rank 2, or	88%

2. Cultural Enrichment (continued)

Cultural Enrichment General	rank 3, or	81%
Physical Education/Recreation	rank 3, or	81%
Mathematics Instruction	rank 4, or	75%
Science, and Social Studies respectively	rank 5, or	66%

c. The frequencies or ranks of the Service Areas were:

Transportation	rank 1, or	100%
In-service Staff Training	rank 2, or	88%
Library, Health, Food, and Clothing services, respectively	rank 3, or	81%
School Social Work, Guidance and Counseling respectively	rank 4, or	50%
Psychological Service	rank 5, or	37%

3. Pre-school Opportunities

a. Seven (7) or 12% of the total projects were in this category.

b. The ranks and percentages frequencies of the Instructional Areas utilized to implement objectives were:

Cultural Enrichment-General	rank 1, or	100%
Art	rank 2, or	83%
Physical Education/Recreation	rank 2, or	83%
Teacher Aides and Other Subprofessional	rank 2, or	83%
English Language Arts	rank 3, or	67%
Music	rank 3, or	67%
Science	rank 4, or	50%
Reading Readiness	rank 5, or	33%

c. The ranks and percentages of the Instructional Areas utilized were:

Inservice Training for Staff Personnel	rank 1, or	100%
Health Service	rank 2, or	83%
Food-Lunch	rank 3, or	67%
Food-Snacks	rank 3, or	67%
School Social Work	rank 3, or	67%
Related Services for Parents	rank 3, or	67%
Transportation	rank 3, or	67%
Preservice Training for Staff	rank 3, or	67%
Library Services	rank 4, or	50%
Guidance and Counseling	rank 4, or	50%
Research Services	rank 5, or	33%

4. School Drop-outs

a. Two (2) or 3% of the total projects were in this category.

b. The two projects were a continuation of each other in the same LEA. The frequency of the Instructional Areas utilized to implement the objectives were the same. They were:

Reduction of Class Size, Work Study, Teacher Aides, Cultural Enrichment, English Language Arts, Reading, Music, and Physical Education.

c. As for b. above, the Instructional Areas used for this category are listed as follows:

Library Services, Tutoring after School, Related Services for Parents, School Social Work, Health (dental and physical examinations), Food-lunch, Clothing, Transportation, Inservice and Preservice Training of Staff.

5. Articulation Skills

a. Two (2) or 3% of the total projects were in the category.

b. The ranks and percentages-frequencies of the Instructional Areas utilized were:

English Language Arts----------rank 1, or 100%
Reading----------rank 1, or 100%
Teacher Aides and Subprofessionals----------rank 1, or 100%
Speech Therapy----------rank 2, or 50%
Cultural Enrichment----------rank 2, or 50%
Social Studies----------rank 2, or 50%
Physical Education/Recreation----------rank 2, or 50%

c. The ranks and percentage frequencies for Service Areas were:

Psychological Services----------rank 1, or 100%
Transportation----------rank 1, or 100%
Food-Lunch----------rank 1, or 100%
Inservice Training of Staff----------rank 1, or 100%
School Social Work----------rank 2, or 50%
Guidance and Counseling----------rank 2, or 50%
Preservice Training of Staff----------rank 2, or 50%

Special Note Regarding Programs for Handicapped Children

In Maryland, when the provisions of P. L. 89-313 became known and arrangements were made for their implementation, very little time remained in fiscal 1966. However, projects were developed and submitted by schools for handicapped children conducted by the Maryland State Department of Mental Hygiene, by the Maryland School for the Blind, and by the Maryland School for the Deaf. These institutions embraced the opportunities afforded them, and we feel that, despite certain handicaps involved in administrative procedures, significant benefits were derived.

Problems in addition to those already cited or implied regarding the brevity of time for the implementation of the program are perhaps worthy of mention. There is need for personnel to maintain a closer working relationship between such schools and other educational agencies in the State than is now possible. Secondly, the manner in which such institutions are conducted is different from that for public school systems and, in many cases, differs from one type of institution to another and from those in one state to another. As a consequence, there is a great need for guidance regarding the implementation of such programs in special schools; this guidance needs to be more thoroughly developed at the Federal level as a foundation for its interpretation at the local level in a form sufficiently flexible for such local adaptation. We feel that in our State we have a sincere desire to provide benefits to all of those who deserve and need such benefits; however, both we and officials in the various institutions experience considerable frustration in implementing such programs at this stage. Suffice it to say, we feel that the program for special schools has had more benefits than handicaps, and we hope that we can continue to work with and to improve its operation in Maryland.

JAMES A SENSENBAUGH
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
301 WEST PRESTON STREET, BALTIMORE 21201

LEA's Project Evaluation to support 10% sample. Reference Item #10 (d) Title I Evaluation Report.

Enclosed project numbers:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55.